

DISTANCE GEOMETRY IN QUASIHYPERMETRIC SPACES. II

PETER NICKOLAS AND REINHARD WOLF

ABSTRACT. Let (X, d) be a compact metric space and let $\mathcal{M}(X)$ denote the space of all finite signed Borel measures on X . Define $I: \mathcal{M}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$I(\mu) = \int_X \int_X d(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y),$$

and set $M(X) = \sup I(\mu)$, where μ ranges over the collection of signed measures in $\mathcal{M}(X)$ of total mass 1. This paper, with an earlier and a subsequent paper [Peter Nickolas and Reinhard Wolf, *Distance geometry in quasihypermetric spaces. I and III*], investigates the geometric constant $M(X)$ and its relationship to the metric properties of X and the functional-analytic properties of a certain subspace of $\mathcal{M}(X)$ when equipped with a natural semi-inner product. Using the work of the earlier paper, this paper explores measures which attain the supremum defining $M(X)$, sequences of measures which approximate the supremum when the supremum is not attained and conditions implying or equivalent to the finiteness of $M(X)$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let (X, d) be a compact metric space and let $\mathcal{M}(X)$ denote the space of all finite signed Borel measures on X . Define functionals $I: \mathcal{M}(X) \times \mathcal{M}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $I: \mathcal{M}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$I(\mu, \nu) = \int_X \int_X d(x, y) d\mu(x) d\nu(y) \quad \text{and} \quad I(\mu) = I(\mu, \mu) = \int_X \int_X d(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y)$$

for $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$, and set

$$M(X) = \sup I(\mu),$$

where μ ranges over $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$, the collection of signed measures in $\mathcal{M}(X)$ of total mass 1.

Our interest in this paper and in the earlier and later papers [8] and [9] is in the properties of the geometric constant $M(X)$. In [8], we observed that if (X, d) does not have the quasihypermetric property, then $M(X)$ is infinite, and thus the context of our study for the most part is that of quasihypermetric spaces. Recall (see [8]) that (X, d)

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 51K05; secondary 54E45, 31C45.

Key words and phrases. Compact metric space, finite metric space, quasihypermetric space, space of negative type, metric embedding, signed measure, signed measure of mass zero, spaces of measures, distance geometry, geometric constant.

is *quasihypermetric* if for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, all $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = 0$, and all $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$, we have

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n \alpha_i \alpha_j d(x_i, x_j) \leq 0.$$

(Other authors refer to quasihypermetric spaces, or their metrics, as of *negative type*; see, for example, [4] and [7].) It is straightforward to confirm that a compact metric space (X, d) is quasihypermetric if and only if $I(\mu) \leq 0$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_0(X)$, the subspace of $\mathcal{M}(X)$ consisting of all signed measures of mass 0 (see Theorem 3.2 of [8]).

In the presence of the quasihypermetric property, a natural semi-inner product space structure becomes available on $\mathcal{M}_0(X)$. Specifically, for $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}_0(X)$, we define

$$(\mu \mid \nu) = -I(\mu, \nu),$$

and we denote the resulting semi-inner product space by $E_0(X)$. The associated semi-norm $\|\cdot\|$ on $E_0(X)$ is then given by

$$\|\mu\| = [-I(\mu)]^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The semi-inner product space $E_0(X)$ is in many ways the key to our analysis of the constant $M(X)$. In [8], we developed the properties of $E_0(X)$ in a detailed way, exploring in particular the properties of several operators and functionals associated with $E_0(X)$, some questions related to its topology, and the question of completeness. Questions directly relating to the constant $M(X)$ were examined in [8] only when they had a direct bearing on this general analysis.

In this paper, we use the framework provided by our work in [8] to deal directly and in some detail with questions about $M(X)$. Specifically, we discuss

- (1) maximal measures, that is, measures which attain the supremum defining $M(X)$,
- (2) sequences of measures which approximate the supremum when no maximal measure exists, and
- (3) conditions implying or equivalent to the finiteness of $M(X)$.

We assume here that the reader has read [8], and we repeat its definitions and results here only as necessary. Also, in [8] the background to our work, and in particular the contributions of other authors (see [2, 3, 5, 6, 10], for example), was discussed in some detail, and this discussion will not be repeated here. The paper [9] deals with further questions about $M(X)$, relating especially to metric embeddings of X and the properties of $M(X)$ when X is a finite metric space.

2. DEFINITIONS AND NOTATION

Let (X, d) (abbreviated when possible to X) be a compact metric space. The diameter of X is denoted by $D(X)$. We denote by $C(X)$ the Banach space of all real-valued continuous functions on X equipped with the usual sup-norm. Further,

- $\mathcal{M}(X)$ denotes the space of all finite signed Borel measures on X ,
- $\mathcal{M}_0(X)$ denotes the subspace of $\mathcal{M}(X)$ consisting of all measures of total mass 0,
- $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$ denotes the affine subspace of $\mathcal{M}(X)$ consisting of all measures of total mass 1,
- $\mathcal{M}^+(X)$ denotes the set of all positive measures in $\mathcal{M}(X)$, and
- $\mathcal{M}_1^+(X)$ denotes the intersection of $\mathcal{M}^+(X)$ and $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$, the set of all probability measures on X .

For $x \in X$, the atomic measure at x is denoted by δ_x .

The functionals $I(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $I(\cdot)$ defined earlier play a central role in our work. A related functional $J(\cdot)$ on $\mathcal{M}(X)$ is defined for each $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ by $J(\mu)(\nu) = I(\mu, \nu)$ for $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$. For $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$, the function $d_\mu \in C(X)$ is defined by

$$d_\mu(x) = \int_X d(x, y) d\mu(y)$$

for $x \in X$. Finally, as noted earlier, we define

$$M(X) = \sup\{I(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)\}.$$

3. MAXIMAL AND INVARIANT MEASURES

We call a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$ *maximal* if $I(\mu) = M(X)$, and we call a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ *d-invariant* if there exists $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $d_\mu(x) = c$ for all $x \in X$; the number c is then called the *value* of μ .

Our first result deals with the relationship between maximal and invariant measures. (Recall from Definition 3.3 of [8] that a compact quasihypermetric space (X, d) is said to be strictly quasihypermetric if $I(\mu) = 0$ only when $\mu = 0$, for $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_0(X)$.)

Theorem 3.1. *Let (X, d) be a compact metric space.*

- (1) *If $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$ is a maximal measure, then μ is d-invariant with value $M(X)$.*
- (2) *If X is quasihypermetric and if $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$ is d-invariant with value c , then μ is maximal and $M(X) = c$.*
- (3) *If X is strictly quasihypermetric, then there can exist at most one maximal measure in $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$.*
- (4) *If X is strictly quasihypermetric, then there can exist at most one d-invariant measure in $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$.*

Proof. (1) We may clearly assume that X is non-singleton, so that $M(X) > 0$. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$ be maximal. Assume first that $d_\mu(x) > M(X)$ for some $x \in X$. Choose $\epsilon > 0$ such that $d_\mu(x) > M(X) + \epsilon$, and let $\alpha = M(X)/(M(X) + \epsilon)$. Then for $\mu_\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$ defined by $\mu_\alpha = \alpha\mu + (1 - \alpha)\delta_x$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} I(\mu_\alpha) &= \alpha^2 I(\mu) + 2\alpha(1 - \alpha) d_\mu(x) \\ &= \alpha^2 M(X) + 2\alpha(1 - \alpha) d_\mu(x) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&> \alpha^2 M(X) + 2\alpha(1 - \alpha)(M(X) + \epsilon) \\
&= M(X)((\alpha - 1)^2 + 1) \\
&> M(X),
\end{aligned}$$

a contradiction.

Now assume that $d_\mu(x) < M(X)$ for some $x \in X$. Choose $\epsilon > 0$ such that $d_\mu(x) < M(X) - \epsilon$ and $M(X) - 2\epsilon > 0$, and let $\alpha = M(X)/(M(X) - \epsilon)$. Then for $\mu_\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$ defined by $\mu_\alpha = \alpha\mu + (1 - \alpha)\delta_x$, we find as before that $I(\mu_\alpha) > M(X)$, a contradiction. It follows that $d_\mu(x) = M(X)$ for all $x \in X$.

(2) Let d_μ be a constant function on X with value $c \in \mathbb{R}$, for some $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$. For any $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$, we have $2I(\mu, \nu) \geq I(\mu) + I(\nu)$ (see Theorem 3.2 of [8]), and so

$$\begin{aligned}
2c &= 2c\nu(X) \\
&= 2\nu(d_\mu) \\
&= 2I(\mu, \nu) \\
&\geq I(\mu) + I(\nu) \\
&= \mu(d_\mu) + I(\nu) \\
&= \mu(X)c + I(\nu) \\
&= c + I(\nu).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $I(\nu) \leq c$. Finally, $I(\mu) = c$ implies $M(X) = c$, so we conclude that μ is maximal.

(3) Let μ and ν be two maximal measures in $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$. Part (1) implies that $d_\mu(x) = d_\nu(x) = M(X)$ for all $x \in X$. Therefore, if $\varphi = \mu - \nu$, we have $\varphi \in \mathcal{M}_0(X)$ and $I(\varphi) = \varphi(d_\varphi) = \varphi(0) = 0$, and hence $\varphi = 0$.

(4) This follows from (2) and (3). $\square$

Consider the strictly quasihypermetric space $X = [a, b]$, with the usual metric. Theorem 3.1 gives a completely elementary proof that $M([a, b]) < \infty$ (compare [2, Lemma 3.5]).

Corollary 3.2. *Let $X = [a, b]$, where $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $a < b$, and let $d(x, y) = |x - y|$ for all $x, y \in [a, b]$. Then $M([a, b]) = (b - a)/2$.*

Proof. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1([a, b])$ be defined by $\mu = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_a + \delta_b)$. Clearly, we have $d_\mu(x) = (b - a)/2$ for all $x \in [a, b]$. Therefore, by Theorem 3.1 part (2), we have $M([a, b]) = (b - a)/2$. $\square$

Furthermore, we can apply Theorem 3.1 to the quasihypermetric but not strictly quasihypermetric space $X = S^1$, the circle of radius 1, equipped with the arc-length metric (see Example 3.5 of [8]). Indeed, an identical argument and conclusion apply to the sphere S^{n-1} in $\mathbb{R}^n$ equipped with the great-circle metric.

Corollary 3.3. *Let $X = S^1$, the circle of radius 1, equipped with the arc-length metric. Then we have $M(X) = \frac{\pi}{2}$. Moreover, X has multiple maximal/ d -invariant measures.*

Proof. Let x_1 and y_1 be any pair of diametrically opposite points in X and let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$ be defined by $\mu = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{x_1} + \delta_{y_1})$. Clearly, we have $d_\mu(x) = \frac{\pi}{2}$ for all $x \in X$, and hence $M(X) = \frac{\pi}{2}$, by Theorem 3.1 part (2). Since x_1 and y_1 can be chosen arbitrarily, the second claim holds. $\square$

Example 3.4. Consider the compact strictly quasihypermetric space $X = B^3$, the closed ball of radius 1 in $\mathbb{R}^3$, with the usual euclidean metric. It is shown in [1] that $M(X) = 2$ and that $I(\mu) < 2$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$, and that there therefore exists no maximal or invariant measure on X .

The next result will provide us with a fruitful source of examples and counterexamples in our later work.

Theorem 3.5. *Let (X, d_1) and (Y, d_2) be compact metric spaces with $X \cap Y = \emptyset$ and $M(X), M(Y) < \infty$. Let $Z = X \cup Y$, and define $d: Z \times Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by setting*

$$d(x, y) = \begin{cases} d_1(x, y), & \text{for } x, y \in X, \\ d_2(x, y), & \text{for } x, y \in Y, \\ c, & \text{for } x \in X, y \in Y, \end{cases}$$

where $c \in \mathbb{R}$ is such that $2c \geq \max(D(X), D(Y))$. Then we have the following.

- (1) (Z, d) is a compact metric space.
- (2) If X and Y are quasihypermetric, then (Z, d) is quasihypermetric if and only if $2c \geq M(X) + M(Y)$.
- (3) If X and Y are strictly quasihypermetric, then (Z, d) is strictly quasihypermetric if and only if $2c \geq M(X) + M(Y)$ and
 - (a) $2c > M(X) + M(Y)$ or
 - (b) X has no maximal measure or
 - (c) Y has no maximal measure.

Proof. It is straightforward to check that (Z, d) is a compact metric space.

Consider $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_0(Z)$. Then we have $\mu = \mu_1 + \mu_2$, with $\text{supp}(\mu_1) \subseteq X$ and $\text{supp}(\mu_2) \subseteq Y$, so we can regard μ_1, μ_2 as members of $\mathcal{M}(X), \mathcal{M}(Y)$, respectively, and since $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_0(Z)$ we have $0 = \mu_1(Z) + \mu_2(Z) = \mu_1(X) + \mu_2(Y)$. Note that $I(\mu) = I(\mu_1 + \mu_2) = I(\mu_1) + I(\mu_2) + 2c\mu_1(X)\mu_2(Y)$.

Suppose that $\mu_1(X) = 0$, so that $\mu_2(Y) = 0$ also. If X and Y are quasihypermetric, we therefore have $I(\mu) = I(\mu_1) + I(\mu_2) \leq 0$, and if X and Y are moreover strictly quasihypermetric, then $I(\mu) = 0$ implies $I(\mu_1) = I(\mu_2) = 0$, and hence we have $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = 0$, and so $\mu = 0$.

Now suppose that $\mu_1(X) \neq 0$, so that $\mu_2(Y) = -\mu_1(X) \neq 0$. Then we find

$$\begin{aligned} I(\mu) &= \mu_1^2(X) I\left(\frac{\mu_1}{\mu_1(X)}\right) + \mu_2^2(Y) I\left(\frac{\mu_2}{\mu_2(Y)}\right) + 2c\mu_1(X)\mu_2(Y) \\ &= \mu_1^2(X) \left[I\left(\frac{\mu_1}{\mu_1(X)}\right) + I\left(\frac{\mu_2}{\mu_2(Y)}\right) - 2c \right] \\ &\leq \mu_1^2(X) [M(X) + M(Y) - 2c]. \end{aligned}$$

If $2c \geq M(X) + M(Y)$, it follows immediately that $I(\mu) \leq 0$, and also that $I(\mu) < 0$ if $M(X) + M(Y) < 2c$ or $I(\mu_1/\mu_1(X)) < M(X)$ or $I(\mu_2/\mu_2(Y)) < M(Y)$. This proves the reverse implications in (2) and (3).

For the forward implication in (2), suppose that X and Y are quasihypermetric and that $2c < M(X) + M(Y)$. Then there exist $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$ and $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}_1(Y)$ such that $2c < I(\mu_1) + I(\mu_2)$. But now $\mu = \mu_1 - \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}_0(Z)$, and

$$I(\mu) = I(\mu_1) + I(\mu_2) - 2I(\mu_1, \mu_2) > 2c - 2I(\mu_1, \mu_2) = 0,$$

and hence Z is not quasihypermetric.

For the forward implication in (3), suppose that X and Y are strictly quasihypermetric. By part (2), if $2c < M(X) + M(Y)$, then Z is not (strictly) quasihypermetric, so let us assume that $2c \geq M(X) + M(Y)$ and that conditions (a), (b) and (c) in (3) are false. Thus we have $2c = M(X) + M(Y)$ and there exist maximal measures $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$ and $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}_1(Y)$. But now $\mu = \mu_1 - \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}_0(Z)$ is non-zero, and

$$I(\mu) = I(\mu_1) + I(\mu_2) - 2I(\mu_1, \mu_2) = M(X) + M(Y) - 2c = 0,$$

and hence Z is not strictly quasihypermetric. $\square$

Theorem 3.6. *Let the metric spaces (X, d_1) , (Y, d_2) and (Z, d) , and the constant c satisfying $2c \geq \max(D(X), D(Y))$, be as in Theorem 3.5, with X and Y quasihypermetric. Suppose that $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$, $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}_1(Y)$ are invariant measures. Then*

$$\mu = (M(Y) - c)\mu_1 + (M(X) - c)\mu_2$$

is an invariant measure on Z with value $M(X)M(Y) - c^2$. Further, if X and Y are strictly quasihypermetric, then $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_0(Z)$ if and only if Z is quasihypermetric but not strictly quasihypermetric.

Proof. The first statement is proved by a straightforward calculation. For the second, we note that by Theorem 3.5 and Theorem 3.1 part (2), Z is quasihypermetric but not strictly quasihypermetric if and only if $2c = M(X) + M(Y)$, from which the statement follows. $\square$

Remark 3.7. In the presence of the quasihypermetric property, Theorem 3.1 above shows that invariant measures are maximal, and conversely. When X is not quasihypermetric, on the other hand, Theorem 3.1 of [8] (see Theorem 5.1 below) shows that $M(X) = \infty$, and that the notion of a maximal measure is therefore meaningless. In the

following result, we show that a non-quasihypermetric space may nevertheless have a non-trivial invariant measure.

Theorem 3.8. *There exists a 5-point non-quasihypermetric space with an invariant probability measure of value 1.*

Proof. For $X = \{x_1, x_2\}$ and $Y = \{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$, define

$$d_1(x_i, x_j) = \begin{cases} 0 & i = j, \\ 2 & i \neq j, \end{cases} \quad d_2(y_i, y_j) = \begin{cases} 0 & i = j, \\ 2 & i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

Then (X, d_1) and (Y, d_2) are compact quasihypermetric spaces and $\mu_1 = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{x_1} + \delta_{x_2}) \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$ and $\mu_2 = \frac{1}{3}(\delta_{y_1} + \delta_{y_2} + \delta_{y_3}) \in \mathcal{M}_1(Y)$ are invariant measures. Theorem 3.1 part (2) then implies that they are maximal measures, so that we have $M(X) = 1$ and $M(Y) = \frac{4}{3}$.

Now let $Z = X \cup Y$, and define $d: Z \times Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as in Theorem 3.5, with $c = 1$. Then parts (1) and (2) of Theorem 3.5 imply that (Z, d) is non-quasihypermetric, and we find that $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1^+(Z)$ satisfies $d_{\mu_1}(z) = 1$ for all $z \in Z$. $\square$

4. MAXIMAL AND INVARIANT SEQUENCES

Definition 4.1. Let (X, d) be a compact quasihypermetric space with $M(X) < \infty$. A sequence μ_n in $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$ is called *maximal* if $I(\mu_n) \rightarrow M(X)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark 4.2. While Example 3.4 shows that maximal measures may not exist under the assumption that $M(X) < \infty$, it is of course immediate from the definition that maximal sequences always exist.

We noted in section 4 of [8] that when $M(X) < \infty$ there is a natural extension of the semi-inner product on $E_0(X) = \mathcal{M}_0(X)$ to a semi-inner product on the space $\mathcal{M}(X)$ of all signed Borel measures on X . Specifically, we define

$$(\mu \mid \nu) = (M(X) + 1)\mu(X)\nu(X) - I(\mu, \nu)$$

for $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$, and we denote the resulting semi-inner product space by $E(X)$. This space plays a role in the arguments below.

Remark 4.3. In the context of the semi-inner product space $E(X)$, maximal sequences and maximal measures have the following natural interpretation.

- (1) A sequence μ_n in $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$ is maximal if and only if $\|\mu_n\| \rightarrow \text{dist}(0, \mathcal{M}_1(X)) = 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $\text{dist}(0, \mathcal{M}_1(X))$ denotes the distance of the zero measure to the closed affine subspace $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$ (see Corollary 5.5 of [8]).
- (2) A measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$ is maximal if and only if

$$\|\mu\| = \text{dist}(0, \mathcal{M}_1(X)) = 1.$$

The preceding assertions follow immediately from the observation that $\|\mu\|^2 = M(X) + 1 - I(\mu)$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$.

Remark 4.4. A measure μ in $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$ is maximal if and only if there exists a maximal sequence μ_n in $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$ such that $\|\mu_n - \mu\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For if μ_n is such a sequence, then $\|\mu\| \leq \|\mu_n\| + \|\mu_n - \mu\|$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, so $\|\mu\| \leq 1$ by Remark 4.3 part (1), and the maximality of μ follows by Remark 4.3 part (2).

Recall that if X is a compact quasihypermetric space, then maximal measures in $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$, if they exist, are characterized by the property that they are d -invariant on X (see Theorem 3.1). However, there exist spaces X with $M(X) < \infty$ but without maximal measures (see Example 3.4). In the light of these facts, we make the following definition.

Definition 4.5. Let (X, d) be a compact quasihypermetric space. A sequence μ_n in $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$ is called *d-invariant with value c*, for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$, if

- (1) $\|\mu_n - \mu_m\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$, and
- (2) $d_{\mu_n} \rightarrow c \cdot \underline{1}$ in $C(X)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $\underline{1} \in C(X)$ is defined by $\underline{1}(x) := 1$ for all $x \in X$.

We wish now to investigate the relationship between maximal and invariant sequences (cf. Theorem 3.1 above). We need first the following three lemmas.

Lemma 4.6. Let (X, d) be a compact quasihypermetric space with $M(X) < \infty$. A sequence μ_n in $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$ is maximal if and only if $\|\mu_n - \mu_m\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$ and $(\mu_n \mid \nu) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $\nu \in E_0(X)$.

Proof. The assertion is a well-known fact about semi-inner product spaces, but for completeness we include a proof. Let μ_n be a maximal sequence in $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$. Since $\|\mu\|^2 = M(X) + 1 - I(\mu) \geq 1$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$ (see Remark 4.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|\mu_n - \mu_m\|^2}{4} &= \frac{\|\mu_n\|^2 + \|\mu_m\|^2}{2} - \left\| \frac{\mu_n + \mu_m}{2} \right\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\|\mu_n\|^2 + \|\mu_m\|^2}{2} - 1, \end{aligned}$$

for all n, m , and we conclude by Remark 4.3 part (1) that $\|\mu_n - \mu_m\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$.

Let $\nu \in E_0(X)$. From the fact that $\|\mu_n - \mu_m\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$ it follows that $(\mu_n \mid \nu) \rightarrow \alpha$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Then since $1 \leq \|\mu_n + t\nu\|^2$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, it follows that $0 \leq 2t\alpha + t^2\|\nu\|^2$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and hence $\alpha = 0$.

Conversely, let μ_n be a sequence in $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$ such that $\|\mu_n - \mu_m\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$ and $(\mu_n \mid \nu) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $\nu \in E_0(X)$. Since the measures μ_n form a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{M}(X)$, the norms $\|\mu_n\|$ form a convergent sequence in $\mathbb{R}$, and we define $\beta := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mu_n\|$. Fix $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Now choose $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|\mu_N\|^2 \geq \beta^2 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and $(\|\mu\| + \|\mu_N\|)\|\mu_N - \mu_m\| < \frac{\epsilon}{4}$ for all $m \geq N$. Then

$$\|\mu\|^2 = \|\mu - \mu_N\|^2 + \|\mu_N\|^2 + 2(\mu - \mu_N \mid \mu_N)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \|\mu - \mu_N\|^2 + \|\mu_N\|^2 + 2(\mu - \mu_N \mid \mu_N - \mu_m) + 2(\mu - \mu_N \mid \mu_m) \\
&\geq \|\mu_N\|^2 - 2(\|\mu\| + \|\mu_N\|)\|\mu_N - \mu_m\| + 2(\mu - \mu_N \mid \mu_m) \\
&\geq \beta^2 - \epsilon + 2(\mu - \mu_N \mid \mu_m)
\end{aligned}$$

for all $m \geq N$, and, using the fact that $\mu - \mu_N \in E_0(X)$, we let $m \rightarrow \infty$, obtaining $\|\mu\|^2 \geq \beta^2 - \epsilon$. But μ and ϵ were arbitrary, so it follows that $\|\mu\| \geq \lim_n \|\mu_n\|$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$. Therefore, $\|\mu_n\| \rightarrow \text{dist}(0, \mathcal{M}_1(X))$, and so, by Remark 4.3 part (1), we are done. $\square$

Lemma 4.7. *Let (X, d) be a compact quasihypermetric space. If there exist a sequence μ_n in $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$ and constants $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $I(\mu_n) \rightarrow \alpha$ and $d_{\mu_n} \rightarrow \beta \cdot \underline{1}$ in $C(X)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $M(X) \leq 2\beta - \alpha < \infty$.*

Proof. Let μ be in $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$. Since $d_{\mu_n} \rightarrow \beta \cdot \underline{1}$ in $C(X)$, we have $I(\mu, \mu_n) \rightarrow \beta$. But it is an easy consequence of the quasihypermetric property (see part (5) of Theorem 3.2 of [8]) that $2I(\mu, \mu_n) \geq I(\mu) + I(\mu_n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, which implies that $I(\mu) \leq 2\beta - \alpha$, and hence we have $M(X) \leq 2\beta - \alpha < \infty$. $\square$

Lemma 4.8. *Let (X, d) be a compact quasihypermetric space with $M(X) < \infty$. If μ_n in $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$ is a d -invariant sequence with value c , then $I(\mu_n) \rightarrow c$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$. By assumption, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|\mu_n - \mu_m\| < \epsilon$ for all $n, m \geq N$, and there exists $K > 0$ such that $\|\mu_n\| \leq K$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, for all $n > N$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|I(\mu_n) - c| &\leq |I(\mu_n, \mu_n - \mu_N)| + |I(\mu_n, \mu_N) - c| \\
&= |(\mu_n \mid \mu_n - \mu_N)| + |\mu_N(d_{\mu_n}) - c| \\
&\leq \|\mu_n\| \cdot \|\mu_n - \mu_N\| + |\mu_N(d_{\mu_n}) - c| \\
&\leq \epsilon \cdot K + |\mu_N(d_{\mu_n}) - c|.
\end{aligned}$$

But since $d_{\mu_n} \rightarrow c \cdot \underline{1}$ in $C(X)$, we have $\mu_N(d_{\mu_n}) \rightarrow c$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and the result follows. $\square$

Now we can prove the following counterpart of Theorem 3.1 for sequences of measures.

Theorem 4.9. *Let (X, d) be a compact quasihypermetric space. Then we have the following.*

- (1) *If $M(X) < \infty$ and μ_n is a maximal sequence in $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$, then μ_n is a d -invariant sequence with value $M(X)$.*
- (2) *If μ_n is a d -invariant sequence in $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$ with value c , then $M(X) = c < \infty$ and μ_n is a maximal sequence.*

Proof. (1) Let μ_n be a maximal sequence in $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$. Since $\|\mu_n - \mu_m\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$, by Lemma 4.6, it follows by part (2) of Theorem 5.4 of [8] that $\|d_{\mu_n} - d_{\mu_m}\| \rightarrow 0$ as

$n, m \rightarrow \infty$. Since $C(X)$ is complete, there exists $f \in C(X)$ such that $d_{\mu_n} \rightarrow f \in C(X)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, so that $d_{\mu_n}(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $x \in X$.

Lemma 4.6 again tells us that $(\mu_n | \nu) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for all $\nu \in E_0(X)$. In particular, $(\mu_n | \delta_x - \delta_y) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for all $x, y \in X$. Thus we have both $d_{\mu_n}(x) - d_{\mu_n}(y) \rightarrow 0$ and $d_{\mu_n}(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for all $x, y \in X$, and we conclude that $f(x) = f(y)$ for all $x, y \in X$. Thus μ_n is a d -invariant sequence, and by Lemma 4.8 its value is $M(X)$.

(2) Let μ_n be a d -invariant sequence in $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$ with value c , and fix $x \in X$. It follows immediately from the definition of d -invariance that $\mu_n - \delta_x$ is a Cauchy sequence in $E_0(X)$, and so there exists $\alpha \geq 0$ such that $\|\mu_n - \delta_x\| \rightarrow \alpha$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This gives $2I(\mu_n, \delta_x) - I(\mu_n) \rightarrow \alpha^2$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and since $d_{\mu_n}(x) \rightarrow c$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have $I(\mu_n) \rightarrow 2c - \alpha^2$. Applying Lemma 4.7, we find that $M(X) \leq 2c - (2c - \alpha^2) = \alpha^2 < \infty$. Thus Lemma 4.8 applies, showing that $I(\mu_n) \rightarrow c$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and it follows that $c = \alpha^2$. Therefore $M(X) \leq c$, and since $I(\mu_n) \rightarrow c$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have $M(X) = c$ and $I(\mu_n) \rightarrow M(X)$, and so μ_n is a maximal sequence. $\square$

The equivalence of parts (1) and (2) in the following result is merely a restatement of the definition of a maximal sequence, while the equivalence of parts (2) and (3) is essentially a restatement of Theorem 4.9.

Corollary 4.10. *Let (X, d) be a compact quasihypermetric space. Then the following conditions are equivalent.*

- (1) $M(X) < \infty$.
- (2) *There exists a maximal sequence in $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$.*
- (3) *There exists a d -invariant sequence in $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$.*

This result takes on an especially pleasant form in the case of a finite space (see also Theorem 3.4 of [9]).

Theorem 4.11. *Let (X, d) be a finite quasihypermetric space. Then the following conditions are equivalent.*

- (1) $M(X) < \infty$.
- (2) *There exists a maximal measure in $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$.*
- (3) *There exists a d -invariant measure in $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$.*

Proof. The equivalence of (2) and (3) is given by Theorem 3.1, and the fact that (2) implies (1) is trivial, so we need only confirm that (1) implies (2). If $M(X) < \infty$, then Theorem 4.9 tells us that there exists a sequence μ_n in $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$ which is maximal and is d -invariant with value $M(X)$. By the definition of d -invariance, the sequence μ_n is a Cauchy sequence in the semi-inner product space $E(X)$, which, since X is finite, is complete, by Theorem 6.1 of [8]. Choose $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ such that $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By Corollary 5.5 of [8], the subspace $\mathcal{M}_0(X) = E_0(X)$ is closed in $E(X)$, and therefore so is its translate $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$, and it follows that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$. Now, by Remark 4.4, we conclude that μ is a maximal measure, and so (1) implies (2), as required. $\square$

5. THE FINITENESS OF $M(X)$

We now turn to discussion of $M(X)$, focusing especially on the circumstances under which $M(X)$ is finite. We begin by recalling two of our earlier results from [8] which give information on this question.

Theorem 5.1 (= Theorem 3.1 of [8]). *If (X, d) is a compact non-quasihypermetric space, then $M(X) = \infty$.*

Theorem 5.2 (= Theorem 5.2 of [8]). *Let (X, d) be a compact quasihypermetric space. If there exists $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_0(X)$ which is d -invariant with value $c \neq 0$, then*

- (1) X is not strictly quasihypermetric and
- (2) $M(X) = \infty$.

If X is a finite space, we can give more information.

Theorem 5.3. *Let (X, d) be a finite quasihypermetric space. Then we have the following.*

- (1) *If X is strictly quasihypermetric, then $M(X) < \infty$.*
- (2) *If X is not strictly quasihypermetric, then $M(X) < \infty$ if and only if there exists no d -invariant measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_0(X)$ with value $c \neq 0$.*

Proof. (1) Since X is finite, it follows that $E_0(X)$ is a finite-dimensional normed space, and hence $J(\mu)$ (see section 2) is a bounded linear functional on $E_0(X)$ for each $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$. Therefore, part (3) of Theorem 5.3 of [8] (see also Remark 5.6 of [8]) implies the assertion.

(2) Theorem 5.2 part (2) deals immediately with the forward implication. For the reverse implication, assume that no measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_0(X)$ and constant $c \neq 0$ exist with the property that $d_\mu(x) = c$ for all $x \in X$. Fix $x \in X$, and define $f: E_0(X)/F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by setting $f(\nu + F) = I(\delta_x, \nu)$ for $\nu + F \in E_0(X)/F$. (Recall from Lemma 5.1 of [8] that F denotes the subspace $\{\mu \in E_0(X) : \|\mu\| = 0\}$ of $E_0(X)$.)

If $\nu + F = \nu' + F$, we have $\nu - \nu' \in F$, and hence, by part (5) of Lemma 5.1 of [8], there exists $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $d_{\nu-\nu'}(x) = \gamma$ for all $x \in X$. By our assumption, we have $\gamma = 0$, and hence $I(\delta_x, \nu) = d_\nu(x) = d_{\nu'}(x) = I(\delta_x, \nu')$. Thus f is a well defined linear functional on the finite-dimensional normed space $E_0(X)/F$ (see part (4) of Lemma 5.1 of [8]). Therefore, f is bounded on $E_0(X)/F$, and so there exists $M \geq 0$ such that

$$|I(\delta_x, \nu)| = |f(\nu + F)| \leq M \|\nu + F\| = M \|\nu\|$$

for all $\nu \in E_0(X)$. Now part (2) of Theorem 5.3 of [8] implies that $M(X) < \infty$, as required. $\square$

Theorem 5.4. *There exists a 5-point quasihypermetric, non-strictly quasihypermetric space Z with $M(Z) = \infty$.*

Proof. For $X = \{x_1, x_2\}$ and $Y = \{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$, define

$$d_1(x_i, x_j) = \begin{cases} 0 & i = j, \\ 1 & i \neq j, \end{cases} \quad d_2(y_i, y_j) = \begin{cases} 0 & i = j, \\ \frac{4}{5} & i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to check that (X, d_1) and (Y, d_2) are compact strictly quasihypermetric spaces. It is clear that $\mu_1 = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{x_1} + \delta_{x_2}) \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$ and $\mu_2 = \frac{1}{3}(\delta_{y_1} + \delta_{y_2} + \delta_{y_3}) \in \mathcal{M}_1(Y)$ are invariant measures, and Theorem 3.1 part (2) then implies that they are maximal measures, so that we have $M(X) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $M(Y) = \frac{8}{15}$.

If we let $Z = X \cup Y$ and define $d: Z \times Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as in Theorem 3.5, with $c = \frac{1}{2}(M(X) + M(Y)) = \frac{31}{60}$, then Theorem 3.5 shows that (Z, d) is a quasihypermetric space. Further, Theorem 3.6 implies that $\mu = \mu_1 - \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}_0(X)$ is d -invariant with value $-\frac{1}{60} \neq 0$, and then finally Theorem 5.2 implies that Z is not strictly quasihypermetric and that $M(Z) = \infty$. $\square$

Remark 5.5. Theorem 5.4 constructs a space with 5 points. We note that 5 is the smallest number possible in such an example: in Theorem 5.6 of [9], we show among other things that every metric space with 4 or fewer points must have $M(X) < \infty$.

To complete our survey of the finiteness or otherwise of M , we require the following result and example.

Theorem 5.6. *There exists a compact strictly quasihypermetric space Z with $M(Z) = \infty$.*

Proof. Choose a strictly quasihypermetric compact space (X, d_1) without a maximal measure and with $M(X) < \infty$ (see Example 3.4). Also, let $Y = \{y_1, y_2\}$, and define

$$d_2(y_i, y_j) = \begin{cases} 0, & i = j, \\ D(X), & i \neq j, \end{cases} \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq 2.$$

Of course, (Y, d_2) is a compact strictly quasihypermetric space with $M(Y) = D(X)/2$.

Let $Z = X \cup Y$, and define $d: Z \times Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as in Theorem 3.5, with $c = \frac{1}{2}(M(X) + M(Y))$. Choose two points $x_1, x_2 \in X$ with $D(X) = d(x_1, x_2)$, and note that $I(\frac{1}{2}(\delta_{x_1} + \delta_{x_2})) = D(X)/2$.

Since $M(X)$ is not attained, we have $M(X) > I(\frac{1}{2}(\delta_{x_1} + \delta_{x_2})) = D(X)/2$. Hence $2c \geq \max(M(X) + M(Y), D(X), D(Y))$, and Theorem 3.5 implies that (Z, d) is a compact strictly quasihypermetric space.

Now choose $\mu_n \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$ for each n such that $I(\mu_n) \rightarrow M(X) < \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (we assume that $M(X) < \infty$, since there is otherwise nothing to prove). Define $\nu_n \in \mathcal{M}_1(Z)$ by setting

$$\nu_n = \alpha_n \mu_n + \frac{1}{2}(1 - \alpha_n)(\delta_{y_1} + \delta_{y_2}),$$

where $\alpha_n = (M(X) - I(\mu_n))^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. By assumption, α_n is well defined, $\alpha_n > 0$, and $\alpha_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Now

$$I(\nu_n) = \alpha_n^2 I(\mu_n) + 2c\alpha_n(1 - \alpha_n) + \frac{1}{2}(1 - \alpha_n)^2 D(X),$$

and, expanding and simplifying, we find finally that

$$I(\nu_n) = -1 + \frac{1}{2}D(X) + \alpha_n(M(X) - \frac{1}{2}D(X)) \rightarrow \infty$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, since $M(X) - \frac{1}{2}D(X) > 0$, giving the result. $\square$

Example 5.7. Let X be a 4-point space consisting of any two pairs of diametrically opposite points chosen from the circle of radius 1 with the arc-length metric. By Example 3.5 of [8], X is quasihypermetric but not strictly quasihypermetric, and by Corollary 3.3 (see also Theorem 5.6 of [9]), we have $M(X) < \infty$.

We can sum up our findings so far on the finiteness of $M(X)$ as follows.

Theorem 5.8. *Let (X, d) be a compact metric space.*

- (1) *If X is not quasihypermetric, then $M(X) = \infty$.*
- (2) *If X is quasihypermetric but not strictly quasihypermetric, then $M(X) < \infty$ and $M(X) = \infty$ are both possible.*
- (3) *If X is strictly quasihypermetric, then $M(X) < \infty$ and $M(X) = \infty$ are both possible.*

Proof. Assertion (1) follows from Theorem 3.1 of [8]; assertion (2) follows from Example 5.7 and Theorem 5.4; and assertion (3) follows from Corollary 3.2 and Theorem 5.6. $\square$

We conclude with some remarks on the quasihypermetric property and the strict quasihypermetric property.

For a compact metric space (X, d) , the quasihypermetric property is defined as a condition on the finite subsets of X , although by Theorem 3.2 of [8] the property can also be characterised measure-theoretically. In particular, X is quasihypermetric if and only if every finite subset of X is quasihypermetric. The next result implies that the strict quasihypermetric property cannot be expressed as a condition on finite subsets.

Theorem 5.9. *There exists an infinite compact metric space all of whose proper compact subsets (and its finite subsets in particular) are strictly quasihypermetric but which is not itself strictly quasihypermetric.*

Proof. Let X and Y be copies of the unit circle S^1 in the plane, with the euclidean metric. Note that X and Y are strictly quasihypermetric, that normalised uniform measure on X and Y is invariant, and that therefore, by Theorem 3.1, this measure is the unique maximal measure on X and Y , and $M(X) = M(Y) < \infty$. Form a metric space Z using the mechanism of Theorem 3.5, setting the distance between each $x \in X$

and each $y \in Y$ to be c , where $2c = M(X) + M(Y)$. By Theorem 3.5 part (3), Z is not strictly quasihypermetric.

Let Z' be any proper compact subset of Z , and write $Z' = X' \cup Y'$ for suitable compact subsets $X' \subseteq X$ and $Y' \subseteq Y$, at least one of which is proper. If either X' or Y' has no maximal measure, then Theorem 3.5 part (3) implies immediately that Z' is strictly quasihypermetric. If X' and Y' both have maximal measures, assume without loss of generality that X' is a proper subset of X . Suppose that $M(X') = M(X)$. Then the maximal measure on X' is also a maximal measure on X , but is certainly not uniform measure, and this contradicts the uniqueness given by Theorem 3.1. Therefore, $M(X') < M(X)$. But now $2c > M(X') + M(Y')$, so Theorem 3.5 part (3) implies again that Z' is strictly quasihypermetric. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Alexander, Two notes on metric geometry, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **64**(2), 317–320 (1977).
- [2] R. Alexander and K.B. Stolarsky, Extremal problems of distance geometry related to energy integrals, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **193**, 1–31 (1974).
- [3] G. Björck, Distributions of positive mass, which maximize a certain generalized energy integral, Ark. Mat. **3**, 255–269 (1956).
- [4] J. Bretagnolle, D. Dacunha-Castelle and J.-L. Krivine, Lois stables et espaces L^p , Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Sect. B (N.S.) **2**, 231–259 (1965/1966).
- [5] B. Farkas and Sz. Gy. Révész, Rendezvous numbers of metric spaces—a potential theoretic approach, Arch. Math. (Basel) **86**(3), 268–281 (2006).
- [6] A. Hinrichs, Averaging distances in finite-dimensional normed spaces and John’s ellipsoid, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **130**(2), 579–584 (2002).
- [7] P.G. Hjorth, S.L. Kokkendorff and S. Markvorsen, Hyperbolic spaces are of strictly negative type, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **130**, 175–181 (2002).
- [8] P. Nickolas and R. Wolf, Distance geometry in quasihypermetric spaces. I, Bull. Aust. Math. Soc., to appear.
- [9] P. Nickolas and R. Wolf, Distance geometry in quasihypermetric spaces. III, submitted.
- [10] R. Wolf, On the average distance property and certain energy integrals, Ark. Mat. **35**(2), 387–400 (1997).

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND APPLIED STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG, WOLLONGONG, NSW 2522, AUSTRALIA

E-mail address: peter_nickolas@uow.edu.au

INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT SALZBURG, HELLBRUNNERSTRASSE 34, A-5020 SALZBURG, AUSTRIA

E-mail address: Reinhard.Wolf@sbg.ac.at